DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 816 HE 022 908

AUTHOR Lynch, David M.; Bowker, Lee H.
TITLE The Status of Adult and Continuing Education within American Institutions of Higher Learning.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania. Inst. for Advanced Research.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 86p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Deans; Administrator Role; *Adult Education; College Administration; College Faculty; *Continuing Education; *Deans; Educational Quality; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Job Satisfaction; Merit Pay; National Surveys; Resource Allocation; Tenure

ABSTRACT

Data gathered from a national survey on the status of adult and continuing education in the United States are presented. Chapters cover: continuing education in 410 institutions of higher education (description of the sample, relationships among institutional characteristics, staffing patterns, and support for grants acquisition); the continuing education deanship (personal backgrounds of the deans, job structure, evaluation of the deans, faculty advisory committees, what deans do on the job, satisfactions and frustrations of the deans, and careers, institutions, and futures); teaching and teachers (funding for excellence, tenure, merit salary increases, the dean's teaching revisited, and teaching and unionization); and program quality in continuing education: the dean's perspective (program quality and program evaluation, the dean's impact on quality, and resource allocation). Among the conclusions are that: one in five institutions has the dean as the sole continuing education professional administrator; graduate degrees earned by continuing education deans include doctorates (70%) and other advanced degrees (3%); 54% of the deans experience an annual evaluation; the most general satisfaction for the deans is meeting community and student needs for programs; just over 50% of the chief academic officers in continuing education report teaching at least one course per year; teaching is the most important factor in tenure decisions for faculty working in continuing education; and teaching quality is the factor most frequently reported as very important in the dean's assessment of continuing education. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311816

THE STATUS OF ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION WITHIN AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

by:

DAVID M. LYNCH

LEE H. BOWKER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DAVID M. LYNCH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Graduate School

HE 022908

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IUP, Pa.'s fifth largest institution of higher education, is a state-supported university located 50 miles northeast of Pittsburgh in the beautiful community of Indiana, Pa. The university is comprised of seven colleges and two schools, and offers 13 degrees, from the A.A. through the Ph.D. The university's 12,500 students have over 100 majors from which to choose in 40 departments. IUP also supports two branch campuses, one in Punxsutawney and one in Kittanning.

IUP is most proud of its selection by Barron's Guide to the Most Prestigious Colleges, 1982, as one of the nation's 227 academic best and of its selection by a prominent business magazine as one of the nation's 50 colleges or universities with high academic standing but tuition and fees below the national average.

THE STATUS OF ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION WITHIN AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

by

David M. Lynch
and
Lee H. Bowker
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

This monograph is a publication of the Higher Education Research Program, the Institute for Advanced Research, IUP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables..... 1

Acknowledgments..... 3

Preface..... 4

Chapter I, Continuing Education in 410 Institutions of Higher Education..... 6

Chapter II, The Continuing Education Deanship.....20

Chapter III, Teaching and Teachers.....38

Chapter IV, Quality in Continuing Education: The Dean's Perspective.....55

Chapter V, Summary and Conclusions.....68

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Total Student Enrollment Outside of Continuing Education..... 8
2. Credit and Non-Credit Continuing Education Students..... 9
3. Correlation Matrix of Institutional Characteristics.....13
4. Number of Full-Time Equivalent Professional Administrators Working in Continuing Education.....14
5. Full-Time Equivalent Clerical Staff Working in Continuing Education.....15
6. Signature Authority for Continuing Education Grant Proposals.....18
7. Grant Assistance Provided to Faculty and Staff by the School of Continuing Education.....19
8. Frequency of Continuing Education Deans' Formal Evaluations.....23
9. Existence of Faculty Advisory Committees.....25
10. Relationships Between Selected Institutional Charactersitics and the Existence of Faculty Advisory Committees.....27
11. Teaching Responsibilities of Continuing Education Deans.....29
12. Continuing Education Deans' Committee Memberships.....30
13. Continuing Education Deans' Ranking of the Time They Devote or Ought to Devote to Job Tasks.....31
14. Major Satisfactions of the Continuing Education Deanship.....33
15. Major Frustrations of the Continuing Education Deanship.....34
16. Relationship Between Selected Institutional Characteristics and Continuing Education Deans' Perceptions of Careers, Institutions, and Futures.....36
17. Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and Selected Teaching Variables.....39
18. Availability of Institutional Funds for Selected Educational Activities and Purchases.....41

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

19. Intercorrelation Matrix of Institutional Funding to Support Educational Quality.....43

20. The Relationship Between Selected Institutional Characteristics and the Availability of Institutional Funds for Quality Education.....44

21. Importance of Factors in Tenure Decisions.....46

22. Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and the Weighting of Factors in Tenure Decisions.....48

23. Use of Merit Salary Increases to Encourage Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Public Service.....50

24. Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and the Use of Merit Salary Increases to Support Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Public Service.....51

25. Proportion of Continuing Education Programs Judged to be Outstanding by Continuing Education Deans.....56

26. Frequency of Evaluation of Continuing Education Programs.....57

27. Importance of Factors in the Assessment of Continuing Education Program Quality.....59

28. Relationship Among Selected Factors Used by Deans to Judge Continuing Education Program Quality.....61

29. Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and Factors Used by Deans to Judge Continuing Education Program Quality.....62

30. Extent to Which Continuing Education Deans Affect the Quality of Education.....64

31. Resource Allocation Policies of Continuing Education Deans.....66

32. The Relationship Between the Dean's Resource Allocation Policy and the Importance of National Reputation in Assessing Continuing Education Program Quality.....67

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank J. Richard McFerron for his technical assistance with data analysis on this project. The data entry and analysis team was led by Bill England, who was assisted by Nancy Ritsko, Diane Gift, Steve Holt, and Leslie Mosely. We are indebted to Donna Michalak and Trish Mauro for their assistance in producing this monograph. Richard E. Ray, Acting Associate Graduate Dean for Administration at IUP, provided invaluable editorial advice and assistance. Finally, we acknowledge with pleasure the colleagueship of Nicholas E. Kolb, Dean of Continuing Education at IUP. The errors and confusions that remain are our responsibility alone.

PREFACE

Continuing and adult education in American institutions of higher education have received increased attention during the 1980's as institutions have expanded their public service missions and sought non-traditional students to bolster sagging enrollments or to promote full enrollment growth. Not much is known, however, about the general condition of continuing and adult education from a national perspective. The senior author, while beginning a year-long stint as interim dean of a school of continuing education, looked to the discipline's research base and national professional organizations for guidance in the overall development of policy, program development, resource allocation, funding patterns, and the community service components of institutional missions. The search was not encouraging. With a few notable exceptions, the literature treated specific approaches to individual problems rather than providing a broad national context. The authors had completed a national survey of graduate education during the preceding year and decided to employ a similar methodology for learning more about the condition and status of continuing and adult education in the United States.

This monograph reports the data gathered from that survey. More analytical and theoretical treatments of the data have been and will be disseminated in traditional ways, including journal articles and presentations at professional meetings.

The institutional universe identified by this study included all schools reported by the editors of Peterson's Guides as conducting continuing education programs. From this universe, a random sample of 836

institutions was selected to make up the sampling frame for the study. The survey was mailed to continuing education deans and holders of positions with analogous responsibilities in February 1984. The response rate after one follow-up mailing was 49 percent (410 useable questionnaires were returned). Statistical analysis was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Brent, 1975) as updated by recent releases. Since so many of the variables analyzed are ordinal in nature, bivariate analysis was limited to tau b, a correlational measure for ordinal data.

Chapter I

CONTINUING EDUCATION IN 410 INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In this chapter we describe the basic characteristics of the 410 institutions of higher education included in the study. We also analyze staffing patterns within schools of continuing education, unionization, and institutional membership in various professional organizations, analyses that lead to an examination of institutional funding patterns to support excellence in a variety of areas. The chapter concludes with a discussion of activities to support the acquistion of extramural grants.

Description of the Sample

A variety of institutional characteristics were determined through the survey, including the highest degree offered, the primary source of financial support, geographic setting, faculty size, and student body size. Twenty-eight percent of participating institutions are strictly undergraduate colleges. An additional 45 percent offer the master's degree, while the remaining 27 percent list the doctorate as the highest degree conferred. The sample was evenly split between the public and private nonprofit sectors. Forty-nine percent were public and 51 percent were private institutions. Nonprofit private sector support encompassed both church related (33 percent) and independent private (18 percent) institutions. Geographic settings were also diverse. Specifically, 10 percent were rural, 33 percent small town, 32 percent urban, and 26 percent metropolitan (the percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures).

One dimension of institutional size is the number of full time equivalent faculty. Forty-seven percent of the institutions surveyed had fewer than 150 faculty, 31 percent had between 150 and 499, 14 percent had 500 to 1,000, and 8 percent had more than 1,000 full time equivalent faculty members. Other indices of size are provided when the student body is analyzed. Total student body size, defined as total undergraduate and graduate headcount, excluding credit offerings sponsored by continuing education, is summarized in Table 1. At the extremes, 74 institutions enrolled 1,000 or fewer students while 30 enrolled more than 20,000 students.

The number of continuing education students, whether credit or non-credit, is interesting not only in describing the college or university but also in indicating the scope of the continuing education unit. Despite changing demographic trends nationally and a perceived emphasis on attracting non-traditional students, many continuing education units serve relatively few students. Fully 70 percent of the schools sponsoring continuing education credit offerings, for example, reported credit enrollments of fewer than 1,000 (50 percent actually enrolled fewer than 500). Nineteen percent served between 1,001 and 3,000 such students while only 11 percent enrolled more than 3,000. Similar statistics describe continuing education non-credit offerings (66 percent enrolled 1,000 or fewer, 23 percent attracted between 1,001 and 5,000, and 11 percent reported more than 5,000). These figures are summarized in Table 2.

Table 1

Total Student Enrollment Outside of Continuing Education

Enrollment	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
1,000 or fewer	74	18%
1,001-2,500	109	27%
2,501-10,000	136	34%
10,001-20,000	57	14%
More than 20,000	30	7%
Total	406	100%

Table 2

Credit and Non-Credit Continuing Education Students

	Credit		Non-Credit	
Students	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
500 or fewer	192	50%	260	66%
501-1,000	79	20%		
1,001-3,000	72	19%	92	23%
3,001-5,000	43	11%		
5,001-10,000	0	0%	43	11%
Total	386	100%	395	100%

Relationships Among Institutional Characteristics

The fiscal advantages of public sponsorship over private funding are evident in the data. Public institutions are much larger than private institutions. They have larger faculties and they serve larger numbers of undergraduate, graduate, and both credit and non-credit continuing education students. This fiscal effect is particularly noticeable in graduate education, where the higher cost of doctoral education is simply beyond the resources of most private institutions. Seventy-seven percent of the doctoral institutions in the sample are public, as compared with 51 percent of the master's institutions and only 19 percent of the undergraduate institutions.

Similarly, large public universities offering many graduate and undergraduate degree programs tend to have strong non-credit programs as well as strong credit programs in continuing education. These large public schools thus, serve as the central illustration of correlations identified by the study between institutional characteristics and the number of credit and non-credit continuing education students. The data show a parallel between the characteristics of institutions with strong non-credit programs in continuing education and the characteristics of institutions with strong credit programs. That is to say, institutions that have strong continuing education non-credit programs are also likely to have strong continuing education credit programs. In both cases, these institutions are likely to be large public universities offering many graduate and undergraduate degree programs. These large continuing education programs are somewhat more likely to be found in urban than in rural institutions, which is not

surprising since urban institutions tend to be much larger than rural institutions.

In general, institutions with large continuing education programs are more likely to hold memberships in the Association for Continuing Higher Education (ACHE) and National University Continuing Education Association (NUCEA) than institutions with small continuing education programs. This characteristic is important to note since these organizations are the avenues by which deans and other continuing education professionals stay abreast of new developments and trends in the field. These organizations disseminate new knowledge about continuing education and provide an opportunity for broader professional association for deans. The relationship between the size of a university's continuing education program and institutional membership in ACHE and NUCEA is reflected in a number of ways. For example, this effect is stronger for the number of continuing education credit students than for continuing education non-credit students. The probability of holding membership in ACHE and/or NUCEA rises with increases in all indicators of institutional size. NUCEA membership responds to institutional size more sharply than ACHE membership on all of the dimensions studied, indicating that NUCEA depends on large institutions for its organizational stability to a greater extent than ACHE. Two other differences in the membership distributions of NUCEA and ACHE are that NUCEA draws more heavily from public institutions while ACHE draws more heavily from urban institutions. Of the 410 colleges and universities in the sample, 273 (67 percent) were not members of either association, 97 (24 percent) belonged to NUCEA, 68 (17 percent) held memberships in ACHE, 69 (17 percent) held memberships only in NUCEA, 40 (10 percent) held

memberships only in ACHE, and 28 (7 percent) were members of both associations.

Table 3 presents a correlation matrix formed by the interrelations of the ten basic institutional characteristics used in the study. These correlations reveal something about the distribution of ACHE and NUCEA membership among the colleges and univerisities in the sample and much about the structure of American higher education.

Staffing Patterns

Staffing patterns in schools of continuing education are complex because of the variety of tasks addressed. The professional staff, including the dean, are usually administrators who may or may not teach but whose primary focus is program development and administration. College anduniversity faculty may be assigned to work in the unit on a temporary basis as administrators or as teachers. Adjunct faculty may be employed to teach continuing education courses. An important additional component is the clerical staff.

As noted in Table 4, in one in five cases the dean is the sole continuing education professional administrator. One cannot help but wonder about working conditions and productivity in a school of continuing education directed by "the lonely dean." Twenty-nine percent of the continuing education units employ two or three administrators, 27 percent list four to nine, and 25 percent have ten or more. Only one in five colleges or universities assign faculty members on a temporary basis to work as administrators in the continuing education unit, indicating that innovative approaches to augmenting the administrative work force are not commonplace. The size of clerical staffs, depicted in Table 5, mirrors the

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Institutional Characteristics

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Highest degree offered	x									
2.	Private/public	.41***	x								
3.	Rural/urban	.27***	-.05	x							
4.	Faculty size	.64***	.57***	.21***	x						
5.	Student body size	.64***	.60***	.26***	.81***	x					
6.	Graduate student body size	.61***	.37***	.31***	.71***	.71***	x				
7.	Number of CE credit students	.45***	.38***	.22***	.54***	.52***	.52***	x			
8.	Number of CE non-credit students	.43***	.41***	.18***	.49***	.49***	.50***	.43***	x		
9.	ACHE membership	.23***	.06	.21***	.27***	.28***	.22***	.29***	.18***	x	
10.	NUCEA membership	.44***	.40***	.07	.50***	.44***	.46***	.45***	.35***	.18***	x

Table 4

Number of Full-Time Equivalent Professional Administrators
Working in Continuing Education

Number of Administrators	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
One	75	19%
Two or Three	112	29%
Four to Nine	104	27%
Ten or More	97	25%
Total	388	100%

Table 5

Full-Time Equivalent Clerical Staff Working in Continuing Education

Number of Clerical Staff	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
One	87	23%
Two or Three	111	29%
Four to Nine	89	24%
Ten or More	92	24%
Total	379	100%

diversity found for administrators. One secretary is employed in 23 percent of the cases, two or three in 29 percent, four to nine in 24 percent, and ten or more in 24 percent.

The number of full time equivalent faculty assigned to the continuing education unit reflects the non-traditional role played by continuing education. Forty-five percent of the deans reported that no faculty were so assigned. Presumably, the method used to provide teachers for classes is to negotiate adjunct assignments on a course by course basis with members of the faculty or with local people who have the required expertise. Half of the the remaining 55 percent employ between one and 20 faculty and the other half employ more than 20 faculty. When deans were asked what proportion of credit courses offered by continuing education were taught by part-time (less than .50 FTE) faculty, this presumption gained some support. Thirty-one percent of the respondents reported that part-timers taught fewer than 10 percent of such courses, while 30 percent indicated that between 10 and 24 percent were taught by part-time faculty, and the remaining 40 percent noted that 25 percent or more of the courses used part-time faculty.

Faculties are unionized at 140 of the institutions within the sample. Non-faculty professional staff within continuing education are unionized at 75 sample institutions.

Support for Grants Acquisition

Many continuing education units rely heavily on external funding for support in developing new programs. The level of the continuing education dean's control over grant activity was assessed by surveying signature authority for grant proposals and the kinds of assistance provided to

continuing education faculty and staff who seek grants.

Table 6 shows that signature authority for grant proposals may be invested in several individuals. In more than half the cases the president is a signator. The next most frequent source of other signature authority is the continuing education dean (39 percent), followed closely by the academic vice president or provost (33 percent). The financial vice president is involved less frequently as is another dean or designate (the graduate dean in most institutions).

The range of grant assistance provided to faculty and staff by the schools of continuing education is extensive and varied (see Table 7). Identifying potential funders is the service most frequently provided (75 percent), with services such as typing, developing budgets, and contacting funding sources made available by more than half the deans in the sample. No grant services are provided by 13 percent of the continuing education deans surveyed.

Table 6

Signature Authority for Continuing Education Grant Proposals

Administrator	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
President	205	52%
Academic vice president, provost	131	33%
Continuing education dean	151	39%
Financial vice president	94	24%
Another dean or designate	46	12%
Other	17	10%

Table 7

Grant Assistance Provided to Faculty and Staff
by the School of Continuing Education

Form of Assistance	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Identifying funding sources	282	75%
Typing	215	58%
Developing budgets	214	57%
Contacting funding sources	185	50%
Writing boilerplate	127	34%
Other	17	5%
No grant services provided	47	13%

Chapter II

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION DEANSHIP

In this chapter we analyze the professional development of continuing education deans and their experiences on the job by assessing their personal backgrounds, showing how they are evaluated, and describing their faculty advisory committees and daily job activities. The concluding sections deal with the major satisfactions and frustrations of the continuing education deanship and the deans' ratings of their institutions, their own careers and their futures.

Personal Backgrounds of Continuing Education Deans

Experience in higher education was relatively substantial for most of those continuing education deans surveyed. Fifty-one percent of them have been working in higher education between 11 and 20 years, while another 26 percent have more than 20 years experience. A different picture emerges when service at the current institution and service in the role of dean are considered. The mean length of service at the current institution was 2.5 years, with a majority of the deans (50 percent) having been employed at their current institutions for ten or fewer years. Conversely, 29 percent have been employed at the current institutions for 16 years or more. The mean length of service in the role of the dean was 2.4 years. Fifty-five percent of those deans surveyed had spent fewer than five years in the dean's role, while 21 percent had more than 9 years experience. Although continuing education deans participating in the survey have

substantial experience in higher education, they tend to be relatively inexperienced at their current institution and as deans.

Graduate degrees earned by continuing education deans include doctorates (70 percent) and other advanced degrees (3 percent). The most common disciplines in which continuing education deans earned their doctorates were education, including higher education, educational administration, and adult and continuing education (166 deans); history (25); English (13); and political science (10). No other discipline was represented by more than 5 deans. The small number of "other" degrees ranged from theology to chemistry, with a third being concentrated in various education fields. Most (65 percent) terminal degrees had been earned since 1970, with only 11 percent earned before 1960.

Job Structure

Chief academic officers in continuing education do not all hold the title of continuing education deans. Forty percent of those individuals responding to the survey held the title of "dean" in some form or other. Dean of Continuing Edcuation was noted as the title in 68 instances, followed by Dean of Extension Programs (13), Dean of the University College (11), Dean, Graduate and Continuing Education (11), and Dean, Continuing Education and Summer Sessions (10). "Director" defined the title of 38 percent of the respondents, with 95 individuals holding the title Director of Continuing Education. No other version of the director's title was noted in more than 2 percent of the responses. More prestigious titles in terms of normal administrative hierarchies were found in 9 percent of the cases (e.g. Assistant Provost for Continuing Education, Associate Vice

President for Special Programs and Continuing Education) and less prestigous titles were found in another 9 percent of the responses (e.g. Assistant Academic Dean for Continuing Education, Coordinator of Adult Services). Despite this variety in the titles of chief continuing education academic officers, we will refer to all of them as continuing education deans for ease of presentation in this monograph.

Almost half of the continuing education deans (46 percent) serve in their role as deans at the pleasure of higher administrators. The remaining deans are more likely to hold three year contracts than terms of two years or more than three years. The impression that continuing education deans have little formal protection in American higher education is reinforced by the limited number of tenured faculty backup positions to provide job security. Fifty-nine percent of the continuing education deans studied have no faculty tenure, and 37 percent hold no faculty rank. Only 28 percent hold full professorships in academic departments.

The Evaluation of Continuing Education Deans

Table 8 depicts the frequency with which continuing education deans in the sample were evaluated. The extremes range from annual evaluation for 54 percent of the deans to no formal evaluation ever for 27 percent of them. Although formal evaluations provide only one mechanism for feedback to deans from their supervisors, one wonders about the relatively fluid nature of continuing education programs and the need to maintain close links with university missions, goals, and objectives. Are those deans who receive limited formal evaluations more conservative in their approach to programs and clients than their colleagues? Regretably, the survey did not

Table 8

Frequency of Continuing Education Deans' Formal Evaluations

Frequency of Evaluations	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Annual	219	54%
Two-Three Years	32	8%
Four or More Years	43	11%
Never	111	27%
Total	405	100%

ask for information that would allow more detailed analysis.

Continuing education deans are most commonly evaluated by the provost/academic vice-president (69 percent of all responding deans). Other evaluators include the president (27 percent), faculty (13 percent), and department chairs (9 percent). It is evident that the faculty and students served by continuing education deans rarely have an opportunity to participate in the evaluation of these administrators.

Faculty Advisory Committees

Higher education administrators seek faculty advice on a number of issues related to their professional responsibilities. Table 9 depicts the existence of faculty committees which advise continuing education deans. In more than three-quarters of the institutions surveyed, committees advise the dean on general policy and the credit curriculum. Approximately half have committees to provide advice on the non-credit curriculum and student welfare, while one-fourth have research committees. The existence of such committees may be an effort to institutionalize and legitimize continuing education activity within traditional academic institutions. Do continuing education dean follow the advice of faculty committees? Fifty-nine percent of the deans surveyed reported following committee advice more than 80 percent of the time. Put another way, how influential are faculty committees in establishing the general policy direction of the continuing education unit? Thirty-two percent of responding deans rated advisory committees as not influential or somewhat influential. Forty-four percent believed them to be influential with another 24 percent rating them as very influential over policy development in continuing education. An

Table 9

Existence of Faculty Advisory Committees

Committee	Number of Institutions	Proportion of Respondents
General Policy	293	76%
Credit Curriculum	298	79%
Non-Credit Curriculum	208	55%
Research	91	25%
Student Welfare	178	48%

interesting question to be explored in later research is the relationship between the speed with which continuing education deans must respond to market conditions and constituent needs and the influence of the formal committee structure existing within most colleges and universities.

The level of influence of faculty committees varies with selected institutional characteristics. Faculty committees tend to be less influential in public institutions and in institutions with large faculties, general student populations, and non-credit enrollments. The committee structure also varies across institutional types. Table 10 reveals that general policy committees are less likely to exist in public institutions, those which are ACHE members, and those with relatively large numbers of faculty members, students, and non-credit students. Committees providing advice on the credit curriculum and student welfare are less likely to be constituted in public institutions and those with large faculties, student bodies, and non-credit students. Student welfare committees also are less likely as the number of continuing education credit students increases. Non-credit curriculum and research committees are more likely to be present in universities located in urban and metropolitan settings. Although these correlations are statistically significant, they are not strong enough to be substantively significant. Practice with respect to faculty advisory committees is rather uniform across different types of American colleges and universities.

Table 10

Relationships Between Selected Institutional Characteristics and the Existence of Faculty Advisory Committees[a]

Institutional Characteristic	Faculty Advisory Committee					
	Policy	Credit Curriculum	Non-Credit Curriculum	Research	Students	Other
Highest degree	-.06	-.08*	-.01	.02	-.08	.01
Private/Public	-.09*	-.13**	-.02	.01	-.12*	-.04
Geographic setting	-.02	.02	.17***	.08*	.03	.00
Faculty size	-.11*	-.08*	.01	-.03	-.14**	-.03
Student body	-.12**	-.07	.03	-.01	-.13**	-.00
Graduate student body	-.06	-.06	.05	-.03	-.05	.03
CE credit students	-.08	.02	-.04	-.07	-.11*	-.01
CE non-credit students	-.12**	-.10*	.07	-.02	-.10*	.04
ACHE membership	-.11*	-.02	-.01	-.02	-.04	-.08
NUCEA membership	-.01	-.05	-.02	-.07	-.11*	.03

[a]All correlations shown are tau b.
*Significant at less than .05.
**Significant at less than .01.
***Significant at less than .001.

What Deans Do on the Job

There is always a high level of interest in how people in positions of power spend their time, perhaps because investments of time may reflect policy preferences or the priority placed on the various assigned responsibilities. The continuing education deans survey included questions on teaching, committee membership, time devoted to various job tasks, and time that ought to be devoted to these tasks.

Table 11 points out that more than half of the continuing education deans taught at least one course per year, although their reasons for teaching, whether by preference or job requirement, were not determined by the survey. The next table describes continuing education deans' committee memberships. Combining simple membership with holding the position of committee chair shows that the most common memberships include the credit curriculum (39 percent) and non-credit curriculum (29 percent) committees. The committee most frequently chaired is non-credit curriculum, although the dean holds the role of chair in suprisingly few cases (11 percent). Other significant committee involvement as either a member or the chair is limited to the budget (25 percent) and computer resources (18 percent) committees. The national pattern suggests that while deans may hold membership on insitutional committees concerned with issues immediately relevant to continuing education, their placement on influential institutional committees is limited.

When deans were asked to compare the time they actually spent on 16 job task categories with the time they believe ought to be spent on those tasks, the Spearman correlation was .76 (see Table 13). The five most significant uses of time were conferences with other administrators,

Table 11

Teaching Responsibilities of Continuing Education Deans

Semester Hours Taught Annually	Number of Deans	Proportion of the Sample
None	192	48%
One-Three	93	23%
Four-Six	88	22%
More than Six	30	7%
Total	403	100%

Table 12

Continuing Education Deans' Committee Memberships

Committee	Member*		Chair	
	Number of Institutions	Proportion	Number of Institutions	Proportion
Human subjects protection	23	6%	2	1%
Budget	97	24%	5	1%
Library	36	9%	3	1%
Major equipment	29	7%	8	2%
Graduate council	72	8%	22	5%
Credit curriculum	132	32%	27	7%
Non-credit curriculum	73	18%	43	11%
Computer resources	65	16%	6	2%
Research facilities	23	6%	3	1%

* Does not include chair memberships, which are listed separately.

Table 13

Continuing Education Deans' Ranking of the Time They Devote or Ought to Devote to Job Tasks

Task	Ranks*	
	Time Actually Devoted	Time Ought to be Devoted
Conferences with administrators	1	3
Conferences with faculty and staff	2	2
Representing unit to the external community	3	1
Formal committee meetings	4	5
Preparing administrative reports	5	11
Curriculum development	6	4
Budget	7	8
Personnel matters	8	13
Teaching	9	9
General policy development	10	7
Professional off-campus travel	11	10
Professional reading	12	6
Support of grant-acquisition activity	13	15
Personal research	14	12
Consulting	15	14
Administration of internally-funded research	16	16

* Spearman's rho is .76.

conferences with faculty and staff, representing the unit to the external community, formal committee meetings, and preparing administrative reports. The deans felt that the rank order ought to be: representing the unit to the external community, conferences with faculty and staff, conferences with other administrators, curriculum development, and formal committee meetings. The greatest disparities between the "is" and the "ought" were for preparing administrative reports and personnel matters (on the negative side) and for professional reading (on the positive side).

More than 80 percent of the continuing education deans reported spending at least 5 percent of their time in formal committee meetings and more than one in three reported spending between 10 and 40 percent of their time in these meetings. It should be remembered that this investment of time for committee work is focused on matters of immediate concern to continuing education rather than to those central to institutional governance and management.

Satisfactions and Frustrations of the Continuing Education Deanships

Tables 14 and 15 depict the satisfactions and frustrations of continuing education deans. The most general satisfaction important to continuing education deans is meeting community and student needs for programs (program development, 31 percent; working with students, 20 percent; responding to community needs, 14 percent; and working with faculty and staff, 11 percent). More traditional administrative activities are reported as satisfying to a limited number of deans (decision making, 5 percent; administration, 3 percent; and budgeting, 1 percent).

Table 14

Major Satisfactions of the Continuing Education Deanship

Satisfaction	Listed as the Most Satisfying	Listed as One of the Three Most Satisfying
1. Program development	31%	61%
2. Working with students	20%	41%
3. Responsiveness to community needs	14%	38%
4. Working with faculty and staff	11%	48%
5. Level of challenge	9%	35%
6. Personal satisfaction	7%	21%
7. Decision making	5%	17%
8. Administration	3%	14%
9. Budgeting	1%	7%
10. Other	1%	8%
Total	102%*	**

* Percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures.

** Percentages do not sum 100 because categories are not based on a single 100 percent breakdown.

Table 15

Major Frustrations of the Continuing Education Deanship

Frustration	Listed as the Most Frustrating	Listed as One of the Three Most Frustrating
1. Budgeting	19%	53%
2. Low perception of the value of continuing education	14%	39%
3. Decision making	14%	35%
4. Personnel decisions	12%	33%
5. Time constraints	11%	35%
6. Administration	11%	33%
7. Dealing with faculty	6%	19%
8. Other	6%	34%
9. Personal	4%	13%
10. Program development	3%	12%
11. Dealing with students	1%	5%
Total	100%	*

* Percentages do not sum 100 because categories are not based on a single 100 percent breakdown.

The factor most frequently reported by the deans as frustrating is the combination of administrative activities found attractive to a very small number of deans (budgeting, 19 percent; decision making, 14 percent; personnel decisions, 12 percent; and administration, 11 percent). Fourteen percent reported frustration caused by a low perception of the value of continuing education within the academic community.

Careers, Institutions and Futures

When the deans compared themselves to other academics of their age and qualifications, 30 percent rated their careers as very successful, 55 percent as successful, 6 percent as fairly unsuccessful, and 10 percent as very unsuccessful. Comparing salary using the same criteria produced much less positive results. Thirteen percent rated their salary as making them very successful, 60 percent as fairly successful, 21 percent as fairly unsuccessful, and 7 percent as very unsuccessful. The difference in perception between career and salary success may reflect a salary differential between continuing education deans and deans of traditional colleges within the university as well as an awareness that some deans are paid considerably less per hour than full professors at their universities. These subjective ratings of career and salary vary across institutional types as noted in Table 16. Careers are rated as more successful by deans who work in graduate insitutions with relatively large faculties and student bodies. ACHE membership is also weakly correlated with career success. Ratings of salary are positively correlated with all the institutional characteristics listed in Table 16 except the number of non-credit students.

Table 16

Relationships Between Selected Institutional Characteristics and Continuing Education Deans' Perceptions of Careers, Institutions, and Futures[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Careers, Institutions, and Futures					
	Success of Career	Success of Salary	Feelings about Institution	Extent of Personal Impact on Quality of Education	Likelihood of Leaving Current Position	Type of Position to be Accepted
Highest degree offered	.08*	.13*	.08*	-.03	.03	.02
Private/Public	.08	.14**	.07	-.10*	-.05	-.03
Rural/Urban	.07	.10*	.02	.02	.00	.09*
Faculty Size	.13**	.22***	.09*	-.10*	.06	-.01
Student body	.12**	.19***	.11**	-.08*	-.06	-.02
Graduate student body	.10*	.17***	.02	-.02	-.05	.01
CE credit students	.16***	.21***	.05	.01	-.03	.06
CE non-credit students	.05	.07	.08*	-.03	-.01	.02
ACHE	.09*	.11**	-.03	-.03	.08	.05
NUCEA	.04	.15***	-.00	.01	-.02	-.02

[a] All correlations shown are tau b.
* Significant at less than .05.
** Significant at less than .01.
*** Significant at less than .001.

The deans were also asked how they felt about their college or university. Just over 13 percent rated their institution as nearly perfect, 56 percent as very good, 25 percent as fairly good, and 6 percent as not good for them. Most deans (66 percent) believe it likely that they will leave their current position before they retire. Thirty six percent of those who do not view their current position as terminal plan to advance to a university administrative position above the dean's level, 18 percent plan to return to teaching and research, and 9 percent hope to accept a position in industry. Thirty-eight percent have other plans, such as moving to a similar position in another institution. Some variation in these distributions exists among various types of institutions (see Table 16). For example, better feelings about the insititution are positively correlated with the highest degree offered, the number of faculty, the size of the student body, and the number of continuing education non-credit students. The type of position likely to be accepted after leaving the continuing education deanship varies only with geographic setting, perhaps reflecting the greater number of employment opportunities available in metropolitan settings. No differences were found when institutional type was compared with the likelihood that the dean would leave his or her current position. Taken together, the weakness of these correlations suggest that the most appropriate generalization about these findings is to say that only salary success shows substantial differences by type of institution. Other career characteristics of continuing education deans may vary by dimensions such as the personal competence and quality of job performance of the deans, but they vary very little by the institutional characteristics included in the study.

Chapter III

TEACHING AND TEACHERS

The survey examined the teaching done in continuing education from two view points: (1) the provision of support services for excellence in teaching and (2) the reward system of merit salary raises and tenure for high quality teaching. In addition, continuing education deans were asked about their own teaching schedules, the proportion of credit courses taught by part-time faculty, and the proportion of time that was devoted to teaching by continuing education faculty.

As mentioned in Chapter I, many continuing education credit courses are taught by part-time instructors, at least a quarter of all credit courses being handled by part-timers in 39 percent of the institutions studied. The continuing education faculty and staff devote half or more of their effort to teaching in nearly two-thirds of the institutions. Continuing education deans also teach in many of these colleges and universities. Slightly over half the chief continuing education academic officers reported teaching at least one course per year, and 30 of the continuing education deans taught more than two courses per year on a regular basis.

Table 17 shows how these three teaching variables are distributed among American colleges and universities. The continuing education dean's teaching schedule is not related to any of the institutional characteristics studied. Perhaps the deans' reasons for teaching are idiosyncratic. In any case, the survey did not tap any sources of systematic variation in the dean's teaching schedule.

Table 17

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Selected Teaching Variables[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Credit Hours Taught by the CE Dean	% Credit Courses Taught by Part-time Faculty	% of Faculty Effort Devoted to Teaching
Highest degree offered	.05	.02	-.32***
Private/public	-.02	-.07	-.25***
Rural/urban	-.02	.09	-.28***
Faculty size	-.04	.06	-.28***
Student body size	-.04	.02	-.26***
Graduate student body size	.06	.03	-.24***
Number of CE credit students	.02	.17**	-.18***
Number of CE non-credit students	.01	-.02	-.27***
ACHE membership	-.03	.06	-.10
NUCEA membership	.04	-.04	-.26***

** Significant at less than .01.
*** Significant at less than .001.
[a] All correlations are tau b.

Almost the same statement could be made about the proportion of credit courses taught by part-time faculty. The only relationship reaching statistical significance indicated that the larger the number of continuing education credit students served, the higher the proportion of courses taught by part-timers. However, the proportion of continuing education faculty effort devoted to teaching was a different story. Faculty teaching effort is maximized in small, private, rural, undergraduate institutions in which the number of continuing education students is modest. These institutions are unlikely to hold membership in NUCEA.

Funding for Excellence

Table 18 depicts the opinions of continuing education deans about the institutional funding available for various activities. They generally believe that their institutions more often provide excellent funding for activities in support of teaching than for activities in support of research. Support rated as good or excellent for teaching related activities includes offering courses often enough (61 percent of all institutions), purchasing books for the library (66 percent), and granting sabbaticals for instructors to improve their knowledge of teaching subject matter (50 percent). In contrast, good or excellent support was reported for grant-related travel in only 28 percent of the institutions, for research by senior professors in 33 percent, for research by untenured professors in 25 percent, and for the purchase of research equipment in 38 percent. Looking at the data from the negative side of things shows that approximately half the continuing education deans believe funding to be poor or fair for such activities as sabbaticals to do research, library journals, and travel to conferences while almost two-thirds hold similar

Table 18

Availability of Institutional Funds for
Selected Educational Activities and Purchases

Activities and Purchases	Funds[a]				N
	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
Travel to conferences	17%	36%	35%	12%	384
Travel to develop grants	38%	34%	21%	7%	352
Research by senior professors	28%	39%	26%	7%	333
Research by untenured professors	36%	39%	25%	0%	332
Purchase of computers	14%	29%	41%	16%	371
Purchase of research equipment	23%	39%	30%	8%	342
Purchase of library books	6%	29%	50%	16%	374
Purchase of journals	13%	36%	39%	11%	350
Personnel for grant development	27%	37%	29%	7%	350
Offering courses often enough	12%	28%	49%	12%	339
Research graduate assistants	42%	34%	24%	0%	259
Teaching graduate assistants	30%	33%	27%	10%	283
Sabbaticals to improve knowledge	23%	27%	36%	14%	347
Sabbaticals to do research	25%	28%	35%	12%	217
Full professors' salaries	31%[b]	38%	25%	6%	402

[a] Row percentages do not always sum 100 due to standard rounding procedures.
[b] Combines "poor" and "very poor" to parallel the other factors.

views about support for graduate teaching assistants, and three-quarters find support for graduate research assistants to be poor or fair.

An intercorrelation matrix of these institutional funding levels is presented in Table 19. Only a single negative correlation appears in the entire table, a -.09 correlation between offering courses often enough and having enough personnel available for grant development. Almost all of the positive correlations reach statistical significance, most of them at the .001 level. This tells us a great deal about the structure of American higher education. Although continuing education personnel in a single institution may perceive that competition for internal funding exists among advocates of teaching, research and community service, the national picture is quite different. Wealthy colleges and universities fund all of these activities at a significantly higher level than their less well-funded sister institutions. The "haves" have everything; the "have-nots" are unable to provide adequate funding for excellence in teaching, community service, or research. That is to say, American colleges and universities are highly stratified.

This conclusion receives further support from the evidence in Table 20, which depicts relationships between selected institutional characteristics and the availability institutional funds for quality education. All of the statistically significant correlations are positive, indicating that wealthy institutions tend to be large, public, urban, and graduate. They are likely to have substantial credit and non-credit continuing education enrollments, and to hold membership in ACHE, NUCEA, or both professional associations. The dimensions of sponsorship (private/public) and urbanization are less strongly related to resource

Table 19

Intercorrelation Matrix of Institutional Funding to Support Educational Quality[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Travel to conferences	x														
2. Travel to develop grants	.54***	x													
3. Research by senior professors	.34***	.41***	x												
4. Research by untenured professors	.33***	.35***	.72***	x											
5. Purchase of computers	.24***	.26***	.31***	.25***	x										
6. Purchase of research equipment	.25***	.24***	.29***	.26***	.39***	x									
7. Purchase of library books	.14**	.08*	.10*	.07	.23***	.34***	x								
8. Purchase of journals	.21***	.15**	.08*	.09*	.22***	.11*	.61***	x							
9. Personnel for grant development	.20***	.33***	.18***	.23***	.26***	.37***	.16***	.04	x						
10. Offering courses often enough	.16***	.09	.15**	.12**	.12**	.07	.11*	.26***	-.09*	x					
11. Research graduate assistants	.21***	.22***	.36***	.32***	.17**	.36***	.10*	.06	.29***	.20***	x				
12. Teaching graduate assistants	.22***	.25***	.34***	.33***	.26***	.32***	.08	.00	.29***	.09	.51***	x			
13. Sabbaticals to improve knowledge	.19***	.13**	.27***	.20***	.21***	.22***	.12**	.14**	.04	.22***	.09*	.41***	x		
14. Sabbaticals to do publishable research	.20***	.14*	.28***	.30***	.12*	.23***	.01	.05	.01	.17**	.08	.22**	.85***	x	
15. Full professor's salaries	.14***	.15***	.29***	.22***	.18***	.19***	.06	.08*	.12**	.08*	.25***	.19***	.25***	.22***	x

* Statistically significant at less than .05
** Statistically significant at less than .01
*** Statistically significant at less than .001
[a] All correlations are tau b

Table 20

The Relationship Between Selected Institutional Characteristics and the Availability of Institutional Funds for Quality Education[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Funding Categories													
	Travel to Conferences	Travel to Develop Grants	Research by Senior Professors	Research by Untenured Professors	Computers	Research Equipment	Library Books	Library Journals	Personnel for Grant Development	Offering Courses Often Enough	Graduate Research Assistants	Graduate Teaching Assistants	Sabbaticals to Improve Knowledge	Sabbaticals to Do Research
Highest degree offered	.13**	.12**	.30***	.23***	.11**	.15***	.01	.03	.11*	.02	.49***	.34***	.07	.10*
Private/public	.05	.13**	.16***	.08	.03	.09*	-.04	-.03	.07	-.07	.29***	.12*	.03	-.02
Rural/urban	.04	-.01	.16***	.13**	.06	.05	.02	.07	.02	.08*	.18***	.06	.12**	.07
Faculty size	.16***	.21***	.32***	.26***	.09	.14**	-.06	-.02	.12**	.02	.49***	.27***	.11**	.15**
Student body	.14***	.18***	.31***	.25***	.11**	.14**	-.00	.02	.12**	.02	.46***	.22***	.13**	.14**
Graduate student body	.09	.17***	.33***	.26***	.07	.11*	-.01	.00	.10*	.01	.39***	.23***	.03	.07
Number of CE credit students	.14**	.15***	.28***	.20***	.12**	.15***	-.03	-.02	.12**	.09*	.31***	.22***	.10*	.15**
Number of CE non-credit students	.14**	.23***	.28***	.22***	.05	.06	-.05	-.02	.11*	-.01	.26***	.13**	.06	.00
ACHE membership	.17***	.10*	.18***	.18***	.07	.11*	.01	.02	.09*	.06	.20***	.02	-.00	.03
HSCEA membership	.11**	.12**	.23***	.15**	.03	.06	-.01	.01	.05	-.02	.33***	.16**	.06	.05

[a] All correlations are tau b.

* Significant at less than .05.

** Significant at less than .01.

*** Significant at less than .001.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

availability than highest degree offered and measures of institutional size. Three of the funding categories (library books, library journals, and offering courses often enough) show essentially no difference by institutional characteristics. Perhaps the continuing education deans judged the frequency of course offerings and the volume of library acquistions (both books and journals) to be adequate for the needs of their own programs even though there are huge differences between institutions on these dimensions.

Tenure

We see in Table 21 that teaching is by far the most important factor in tenure decisions for faculty working in continuing education. It is the dominant evaluative dimension in tenure decisions for these faculty members at 80 percent of the institutions studied. Research is the most important tenure factor in 10 percent of the continuing education units, and publications are paramount in 14 percent. These percentages do not sum 100 because the ranks were calculated separately for each tenure factor and the number of institutions varied from 272 to 310 on the various factors (a number of continuing education deans left some tenure factors blank instead of ranking all of them). A second reason for the disconcerting percentages in Table 21 is that some continuing education deans gave the same tenure weight to more than one factor because they were of equal importance in tenure decisions for continuing education faculty at their institutions.

It is surprising to see that community service was rated as the most important tenure factor in only 1 percent of the continuing education units. Community service was among the top three tenure factors in just over a quarter of the institutions (11 percent second most important, 17

Table 21

Importance of Factors in Tenure Decisions

Tenure factors	Ranking in Importance*				N
	First	Second	Third	Other	
Teaching	80%	6%	12%	1%	310
Research	10%	28%	23%	39%	286
Publication	14%	26%	23%	37%	288
University service	2%	45%	15%	39%	287
Professional organization involvement	1%	6%	19%	75%	272
Community service	1%	11%	17%	72%	281

* Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

percent third most important). Service to the university, such as by sitting on university-wide committees, is more important than service to the community in most colleges and universities. Community service is certainly an anemic member of the teaching/research/service triumvirate when it rates so poorly in the tenure decisions of continuing education professors.

The variations in tenure weights by institutional characteristics are summarized in Table 22. The relationships depicted there are of three types. First, the tenure weight of faculty involvement with professional organizations does not differ from one kind of institution to another. Second, research and publication are consistently emphasized in large, public, urban universities that are likely to hold membership in one or both national professional continuing education organizations. Third, teaching, organizational service, and (to a lesser extent) community service are most likely to be given high tenure weights in small, private, rural undergraduate colleges that do not hold membership in either ACHE or NUCEA. In short, institutions that emphasize teaching and service are a rather opposite subset of American colleges from those that emphasize research and publications. Comparing these results with findings on the availability of resources for excellence, it is evident that many of the institutions that are able to offer the highest level of financial support for teaching and service are paradoxically institutions in which faculty who concentrate their efforts in these areas are most likely to be disadvantaged in tenure decisions.

Table 22

Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and the Weighting of Factors in Tenure Decisions[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Tenure Factors					
	Teaching	Research Publications		Service to the College	Involvement with Prof. Orgs.	Community Service
Highest degree offered	-.39***	.32***	.36***	-.34***	.00	-.16*
Private/public	-.23***	.29***	.30***	-.27***	-.11	-.11
Rural/urban	-.35***	.23***	.19**	-.20**	.03	-.18**
Faculty size	-.41***	.33***	.32***	-.37***	-.08	-.18**
Student body size	-.39***	.36***	.34***	-.38***	.05	-.20**
Graduate student body size	-.40***	.25***	.28***	-.34***	-.07	-.06
Number of CE credit students	-.33***	.27***	.34***	-.38***	-.12	-.13*
Number of CE non-credit students	-.40***	.29***	.31***	-.43***	-.13	-.15*
ACHE membership	-.30***	.22**	.17*	-.21**	-.14*	-.11
NUCEA membership	-.25**	.26***	.14*	-.28***	-.07	-.08

[a] All correlations are tau b.
* Significant at less than .05.
** Significant at less than .01.
*** Significant at less than .001.

Merit Salary Increases

Most of the colleges and universities in the sample granted merit salary raises to faculty in recognition of excellence in teaching. Less than half recognized excellence in research through merit raises, and not many more than a quarter of the institutions ever used merit raises to reward faculty for excellence in public service (see Table 23). It must be discouraging for many faculty who work hard carrying out the public service mission of the continuing education unit when they are passed over at merit time and their salaries fall slowly behind those of their peers in traditional academic departments who devote all of their time to classroom teaching and research.

Table 24 shows how merit salary policies differ by institutional characteristics. For most characteristics, there is a linear gradient from research through teaching to public service. Research merit policies are very unevenly distributed among American colleges and universities, teaching much less so, and public service still less. Research is most likely to be rewarded with merit salary raises in large urban, public universities that hold membership in one or both national continuing education professional organizations. Although relationships are weaker, teaching and public service tend to be rewarded by merit salary raises in the same institutions that provide merit awards for research. All statistically significant correlations are in the same direction. Institutions that can afford to reward faculty excellence in research are usually wealthy enough to reward teaching and service too. The questionnaire did not request data on the relative amounts of merit awards,

Table 23

Use of Merit Salary Increases to Encourage Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Public Service

Category	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Teaching	216	58%
Research	153	44%
Public Service	101	29%

Table 24

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and the Use of Merit Salary Increases to Support Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Public Service[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Merit Salary Factors		
	Research	Teaching	Public Service
Highest degree offered	.39***	.11*	.07
Private/public	.29***	.16***	.13**
Rural/urban	.12**	-.03	-.03
Faculty size	.43***	.19***	.13**
Student body size	.42***	.22***	.18***
Graduate student body size	.44***	.25***	.14**
Number of CE credit students	.34***	.10*	.15**
Number of CE non-credit students	.34***	.17***	.14**
ACHE membership	.24***	.04	.01
NUCEA membership	.33***	.14**	.13**

* Significant at less than .05.
** Significant at less than .01.
*** Significant at less than .001.
[a] All correlations are tau b.

but we feel safe in assuming that merit awards for excellence in public service are considerably lower than awards for research and teaching.

The Dean's Teaching Revisited

What does it mean when the continuing education dean teaches courses on a regular basis? Are teaching deans more supportive of the teaching enterprise than deans who never teach? Or is their teaching a reflection of the institution's emphasis on teaching? In either case, we would expect to find substantial correlations between the dean's teaching load and other teaching variables. This was not the case in the continuing education deans study.

The continuing education deans's teaching load was unrelated to the proportion of courses taught by part-time instructors, the proportion of faculty effort devoted to teaching, merit raises for teaching, research or public service, and tenure weights for most faculty activities. The only two statistically significant relationships involving the dean's teaching load were with the tenure weight for research (tau b = -.13) and community service (tau b = .15), and both of these correlations reached only the .05 level of statistical significance. With such weak relationships, it is not possible to support a conjecture as to a systematic pattern of influence between the dean's teaching involvement and other teaching variables in the continuing education unit.

Teaching and Unionization

Is unionization associated with increased or decreased support for teaching? Or is it related to changes in institutional governance and the ways in which continuing education deans and faculty are evaluated? In the

continuing education deans study, unionization was not associated with either higher or lower than average availability of resources in support of teaching. The only support variables correlated with unionization were library funds for the purchase of journals and full professors' salaries. Unionized institutions tend to have fewer journal holdings in their libraries (tau b = -.16 for faculty unionization; -.23 for professional staff unionization) and to pay better salaries at the full professor level (tau b = .25 for faculty unionization; .19 for professional staff unionization). However, continuing education deans in unionized settings were particularly likely to favor strong programs and to ignore weak programs in their resource allocation policies (tau b = -.13 for faculty unionization; -.17 for staff unionization).

No differences in faculty participation in institutional governance were associated with unionization. There were some differences in tenure evaluations, merit awards and the continuing education dean's terms of employment, but these differences were associated only with faculty unionization, not staff unionization. Continuing education deans in unionized settings tended to be evaluated more frequently (tau b = .12) and to have no job protection in their administrative roles (tau b = -.14). Both research (tau b =.23) and publication (tau b = .16) were emphasized more in tenure decisions at unionized than at non-unionized institutions, and merit awards for teaching (tau b = -.24) and research (tau b = -.16) were less likely to be found at unionized than at non-unionized institutions.

These findings leave us with more questions about the relationship between unionization and teaching than they answer for us. There is no consistent pattern of relationships that would lead to an unambiguous

interpretation (except perhaps for the merit salary variables). There also is insufficient evidence to establish causal priority from the cross-sectional data. That is to say, it is not clear whether unionization is the cause or effect in these relationships. Finally, there is evidence that some of the relationships may be spurious. For example, the associations between unionization and an emphasis on research and publications in tenure decision exist partly because it is the larger, more research-oriented institutions in the sample that were most likely to be unionized. Small, teaching-oriented undergraduate institutions have a very low unionization rate. The lack of statistically significant correlations on most variables leads us to our only solid conclusion on the relationship between teaching and unionization, which is that unionization is not associated with a high level of support for the teaching enterprise.

Chapter IV

QUALITY IN CONTINUING EDUCATION: THE DEANS' PERSPECTIVE

The problem addressed in this chapter is continuing education deans' perspectives on the quality of continuing education programs at their institutions. Our discussion will focus on program quality, the processes and factors which influence perceptions of quality, the dean's impact on quality, and the dean's resource allocation policies.

Program Quality and Program Evaluation

Table 25 describes the proportion of continuing education programs judged to be outstanding by continuing education deans. Twenty-four of the respondents felt that none of their programs was outstanding, while three quarters of the deans believed that less than 40 percent of their programs were of outstanding quality. The deans agree that relatively few continuing education programs under their direction are outstanding.

The deans make judgments about program quality are made both formally and informally. Formal program evaluation varies nationally in frequency and the range of participants. Table 26 describes the frequency of evaluation of continuing education programs. Fully half of the deans responding to the survey reported that programs are evaluated annually, while another fifth are evaluated on a two to four year cycle. The remaining 29 percent are subject to review at more than five year intervals or never. Evaluation frequency does not vary significantly with institutional characteristics surveyed, including highest degree offered, source of financial support, degree of urbanization, size of faculty and

Table 25

Proportion of Continuing Education Programs Judged to be Outstanding by Continuing Education Deans

Proportion Judged to be Outstanding	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
None	24	6%
1-19 percent	124	32%
20-39 percent	144	37%
40-59 percent	46	12%
60-79 percent	19	5%
80-100 percent	29	8%
Total	386	100%

Table 26

Frequency of Evaluation of Continuing Education Programs

Frequency of Evaluation	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Annual	198	50%
Two-Four Years	89	22%
Five-Seven Years	58	15%
More than Seven Years	14	4%
Never	40	10%
Total	399	101%*

* Percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures.

student body, and number of continuing education credit and non-credit students.

Participants in the formal evaluation process include faculty and staff, administrators, external evaluators, and others (most notably students). The deans reported that programs are most frequently evaluated by administrators (71 percent), followed by faculty and staff (63 percent), external evaluators (38 percent), and others (27 percent). No statistically significant correlation was found between the various institutional characteristics surveyed and participants in formal evaluations with one exception. A weak negative correlation existed between institutions with large faculties and the inclusion of external evaluators.

When the frequency of program evaluation was cross-tabulated with participants in the evaluative process, statistically significant correlations were found in several cases. Specifically, the frequency of program evaluation tends to increase with the involvement of administrators (tau b = .16) and "others" (tau b = .14), and to decrease with the involvement of external evaluators (tau b = -.27). No significant correlation was found between faculty and staff involvement in evaluation and evaluation frequency.

On a more informal level, continuing education deans exercise professional judgment in assessing the quality of continuing education programs at their institutions. Table 27 reflects the importance of various factors in the dean's assessments of program quality. Teaching quality was most frequently reported as very important in the dean's judgment (87 percent) followed by reputation within the institution (53 percent), student enrollment (48 percent), and the ratio of income

Table 27

Importance of Factors in the Assessment of Continuing Education Program Quality

Factor	Level of Importance*				N
	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	
Grants acquired	6%	16%	44%	35%	381
Publication rate	1%	14%	38%	48%	377
Papers given	3%	16%	46%	36%	376
Conferences or workshops given	12%	40%	33%	15%	379
Student enrollment	48%	45%	6%	1%	389
Teaching quality	87%	13%	0%	0%	391
Reputation in the institution	53%	39%	7%	1%	389
National reputation	9%	33%	36%	22%	379
Student quality	29%	57%	13%	1%	378
Student attrition rate	29%	56%	14%	2%	310
Number and level of content of course offerings	26%	52%	18%	4%	370
Placement of students	16%	47%	28%	9%	304
Ratio of income generated to program expenses	42%	39%	16%	5%	352

* Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

generated to program expenses (42 percent). A correlational matrix of the relationships among selected factors used by deans to judge continuing education program quality is depicted in Table 28. In institutions where deans consider teaching quality important in assessing program quality, internal reputation tends to be viewed as more important than student enrollment or the ratio of income generated to expenses. A high emphasis on internal reputation is positively correlated with a high emphasis on student enrollment, teaching quality, and the ratio of income generated to expenses. The higher the emphasis on student enrollment, the greater the emphasis on internal reputation, the ratio of income generated to expenses, and teaching quality. When deans consider the ratio of income generated to expenses important in their assessment of program quality, internal reputation and student enrollment are also likely to be important.

Table 29 describes relationships among a group of institutional characteristics and selected factors used by deans to judge continuing education program quality. The acquisition of grants is of importance in institutions with large faculties, high numbers of total students, and large non-credit student enrollments. Publication rates and paper presentations appear to have significance for deans in graduate institutions and those with both large faculties and large total student bodies. The presentation of papers is also positively correlated with the number of graduate students. When conferences or workshops are considered important by deans, institutions tend to offer graduate degrees, have many graduate students, sizable faculties, and large populations of credit and non-credit students. The impact of national reputation on the dean's judgment is strongly related to all listed dimensions, while similar but weaker tendencies exist for the ratio of income generated to expenses.

Table 28

Relationships Among Selected Factors Used by Deans to Judge Continuing Education Program Quality[a]

	1	2	3	4
1. Teaching quality	x			
2. Internal reputation	.18***	x		
3. Student enrollment	.09*	.21***	x	
4. Ratio of income generated to expenses	.06	.13**	.12*	x

[a] All correlations shown are tau b.

* Significant at less than .05.
** Significant at less than .01.
*** Significant at less than .001.

Table 29

Selected Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Factors Used by Deans to Judge Continuing Education Program Quality[a]

Institutional Characteristics	Program Quality Factors					
	Grants	Publications	Papers Presented	Conferences or Workshops Given	National Reputation	Ratio of Income to Expenses
Highest degree offered	.07	.13**	.20***	.15***	.23***	.15**
Faculty size	.12**	.15**	.15**	.16***	.28***	.09*
Number of students	.10*	.14**	.16***	.17***	.24***	.11*
Number of grad. students	.05	.08	.12*	.17***	.22***	.10*
Number of CE credit students	.01	.08	.06	.05	.15***	.09*
Number of CE non-credit students	.12**	.04	.07	.30***	.23***	.17***

* Significant at less than .05
** Significant at less than .01
*** Significant at less than .001

[a] All correlations shown are tau b

Interrelating the dean's informal criteria for assessing continuing education program quality with participants in the formal evaluation process produces interesting correlations. For example, faculty and staff are more likely to be involved in the formal process when the dean views teaching quality, conferences given, and national reputation as important in assessing quality. When student quality is viewed as significant, administrators, external evaluators and others are likely to be included in the formal process.

The Dean's Impact on Quality

Table 30 depicts the opinions of those deans surveyed about the extent to which they impact the quality of education generally at their institutions. Forty-one percent felt that such impact was limited or nonexistent, reflecting the widespread belief about the lack of centrality of the role and placement of continuing education deans. However, almost 60 percent believe they have a fair or great impact on the quality of education.

When the deans' perception of impact on the quality of education was broken down by selected institutional characteristics, no significant correlation was found with the highest degree offered, the degree of urbanization, the number of graduate students, or the number of credit or non-credit continuing education students. However, deans who work in public (as opposed to private) institutions and those with large faculties and large student bodies tend to believe their impact on quality is limited.

Table 30

Extent to Which Continuing Education Deans Affect the Quality of Education

Extent of Impact	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Not at all	5	1%
Limited	158	40%
Fairly much	145	36%
Very much	90	23%
Total	398	100%

Resource Allocation

Continuing education deans rarely spend much money to upgrade fair or inferior programs. Maintaining outstanding programs or upgrading good programs so that they become outstanding comprise the resource allocation policies of 95 percent of the deans, as compared with only 6 percent (percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures) who concentrate on upgrading fair or inferior programs (see Table 31). The tendency to centralize resources in the most prestigious programs is most pronounced when the dean views national reputation as important in judging program quality (see Table 32). National reputation is important or very important in more than half of the intitutions in which continuing education deans concentrate their resources on maintaining outstanding programs, as compared with just over a third of the institutions in which continuing education deans have a general policy of upgrading programs that are less than outstanding. The tendency to concentrate resources in outstanding programs is even greater as the number of outstanding programs within an institution increases (tau b = .15).

The data suggest that resource allocation policies employed by deans do not vary significantly with most institutional characteristics surveyed. For example, deans in undergraduate institutions do not allocate resources differently than deans in institutions which offer graduate programs. The sole exception is a weak tendency (tau b = -.08) for deans at institutions with large faculties to be more likely than deans at other institutions to concentrate resources even further in maintaining outstanding programs.

Table 31

Resource Allocation Policies of Continuing Education Deans

Allocation Policy	Number of Institutions	Proportion of the Sample
Maintain outstanding programs	149	41%
Upgrade good programs	114	31%
Both of the above	84	23%
Upgrade fair or inferior programs	21	6%
Total	368	101%*

* Percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 32

The Relationship Between the Dean's Resource Allocation Policy and the Importance of National Reputation in Assessing Continuing Education Program Quality

Importance of National Reputation	Dean's Allocation Policy	
	Maintain Outstanding Programs	Upgrade Other Programs
Very Important and Important	51%	37%
Not Important and Somewhat Important	49%	63%
N	136	212

Tau b = .13, significant at less than .01.

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Staffing patterns in schools of continuing education are complex because of the variety of tasks addressed. The professional staff, including the dean, are usually administrators who may or may not teach but whose primary focus is program development and administration. College and university faculty may be assigned to work in the unit on a temporary basis as administrators or as teachers.

In one in five institutions the dean is the sole continuing education professional administrator. One cannot help but wonder about working conditions and productivity in a school of continuing education directed by "the lonely dean." Twenty-nine percent of the continuing education units employ two or three administrators, 27 percent list four to nine, and 25 percent have ten or more. Only one in five colleges or universities assign faculty members on a temporary basis to work as administrators in the continuing education unit.

The size of the clerical staff mirrors the diversity found for administrators. One secretary is employed in 23 percent of the cases, two or three in 29 percent, four to nine in 24 percent, and ten or more in 24 percent.

The number of full time equivalent faculty assigned to the continuing education unit reflects the non-traditional role played by continuing education. Forty-five percent of the deans reported that no faculty were so assigned. Presumably, the method used to provide teachers for classes is to negotiate adjunct assignments on a course by course basis with

members of the faculty or with locals who have the required expertise. Half of the remaining 55 percent employ between one and 20 faculty and the other half employ more than 20 faculty.

Many continuing education units rely heavily on external funding for support in developing new programs, but signature authority for grant proposals is not usually vested in the continuing education dean. In more than half the cases the president is a signator. The next most frequent source of signature authority is the continuing education dean (39 percent), followed closely by the academic vice president or provost (33 percent). The financial vice president is involved less frequently, as is another dean or designate (the graduate dean in most institutions).

The Continuing Education Deanship

Experience in higher education was relatively substantial for most of those continuing education deans surveyed. Fifty-one percent of the continuing education deans have been working in higher education between 11 and 20 years, while another 26 percent have more than 20 years experience. A different picture emerges when service at the current institution and service in the role of dean are considered. The mean length of service at the current institution was 2.5 years, and the mean length of service in the role of the dean was 2.4 years. Although continuing education deans participating in the survey have substantial experience in higher education, they tend to be relatively inexperienced at their current institution and as deans.

Graduate degrees earned by continuing education deans include doctorates (70 percent) and other advanced degrees (3 percent). The most common disciplines in which continuing education deans earned their

doctorates were education, including higher education, educational administration, and adult and continuing education (166 deans); history (25); English (13); and political science (10). No other discipline was represented by more than 5 deans.

Chief academic officers in continuing education do not all hold the title of continuing education deans. Forty percent of those individuals responding to the survey held the title of "dean" in some form or other. "Director" defined the title of 38 percent of the respondents. More prestigious titles in terms of normal administrative hierarchies were found in 9 percent of the cases (e.g. Assistant Provost for Continuing Education, Associate Vice President for Special Programs and Continuing Education) and less prestigous titles were found among the other continuing education leaders. All of these individuals have been referred to as continuing education deans throughout this monograph.

Almost half of the continuing education deans (46 percent) serve in their role as deans at the pleasure of higher administrators. The remaining deans are more likely to hold three year contracts than any other term of service. The impression that continuing education deans have little formal protection in American higher education is reinforced by the limited number of tenured faculty backup positions to provide job security. Fifty-nine percent of the continuing education deans studied have no tenure as faculty persons, and 37 percent hold no faculty rank. Only 28 percent hold full professorships in academic departments.

Fifty-four percent of the continuing education deans experience an annual evaluation, while no formal evaluation is ever performed for 27 percent of the deans. The other deans are evaluated at intervals of two or

more years. Although formal evaluations provide only one mechanism for feedback to deans from their supervisors, one wonders about the consequences of infrequent evaluation given the relatively fluid nature of continuing education programs and the need to maintain close links with university missions, goals, and objectives.

Higher education administrators seek faculty advice on a number of issues related to their professional responsibilities. In more than three-quarters of the institutions surveyed, committees advise the continuing education dean on general academic policy and the credit curriculum. Approximately half have committees to provide advice on the non-credit curriculum and student welfare, while one-fourth have research committees. The existence of such committees may be an effort to institutionalize and legitimize continuing education activity within traditional academic institutions. Do continuing education deans follow the advice of faculty committees? Fifty-nine percent of the deans surveyed reported following committee advice more than 80 percent of the time. Put another way, how influential are faculty committees in establishing the general policy direction of the continuing education unit? Thirty-two percent of responding deans rated advisory committees as not influential or somewhat influential. Forty-four percent believed them to be influential with another 24 percent rating them as very influential over policy development in continuing education. The most common committee memberships held by the continuing education dean include credit curriculum (39 percent), non-credit curriculum (39 percent), budget (25 percent) and computer resources (18 percent). The national pattern suggests that while deans may hold membership on institutional committees concerned with issues

immediately relevant to continuing education, their placement on influential institutional committees is limited. The level of influence of faculty committees varies with selected institutional characterisitics. Faculty committees tend to be less influential in public institutions and in institutions with large faculties, general student populations, and non-credit enrollments.

The five most significant uses of the continuing education dean's time were conferences with other administrators, conferences with faculty and staff, representing the unit to the external community, formal committee meetings, and preparing administrative reports. The deans felt that the rank order ought to be: representing the unit to the external community, conferences with faculty and staff, conferences with other administrators, curriculum development, and formal committee meetings. The rank order correlation between time spent and time preferred to be spent on 16 major tasks was .76, indicating that the deans do largely what they think they ought to be doing on their jobs.

The most general satisfaction important to continuing education deans is meeting community and student needs for programs (program development, 31 percent; working with students, 20 percent; responding to community needs, 14 percent; and working with faculty and staff, 11 percent). More traditional administrative activities are reported as satisfying to a limited number of deans (decision making, 5 percent; administration, 3 percent; and budgeting, 1 percent).

The activities most frequently reported by the deans as frustrating are budgeting (19 percent), decision making (14 percent), personnel decisions (12 percent), and administration (11 percent). Fourteen percent

reported frustration caused by a low perception of the value of continuing education within the academic community.

When the deans compared themselves to other academics of their age and qualifications, 30 percent rated their careers as very successful, 55 percent as successful, 6 percent as fairly unsuccessful, and 10 percent as very unsuccessful. Comparing salary using the same criteria produced much less positive results. Thirteen percent rated their salary as very successful, 60 percent as fairly successful, 21 percent as fairly unsuccessful, and 7 percent as very unsuccessful. The difference in perception between career and salary success may reflect a salary differential between continuing education deans and deans of traditional colleges within the university as well as an awareness that some deans are paid considerably less per hour than full professors at their universities. Careers and salaries are rated as more successful by deans who work in graduate institutions with relatively large faculties and student bodies than by their colleagues in other institutions.

The deans were also asked how they felt about their college or university. Just over 13 percent rated their institution as nearly perfect, 56 percent as very good, 25 percent as fairly good, and 6 percent as not good for them. Most deans (66 percent) believe it likely that they will leave their current position before they retire. Thirty-six percent of those who do not view their current position as terminal plan to advance to a university administrative position above the dean's level, 18 percent plan to return to teaching and research, and 9 percent hope to accept a position in industry. Thirty-eight percent have other plans, such as moving to a similar position in another institution.

Teaching and Teachers

The continuing education faculty and staff devote half or more of their effort to teaching in nearly two-thirds of the institutions. Continuing education deans also teach in many of these colleges and universities. Slightly over half the chief academic officers in continuing education reported teaching at least one course per year and 30 of the continuing education deans taught more than two courses per year on a regular basis.

Support rated by continuing education deans as good or excellent for teaching related activities includes offering courses often enough (61 percent of all institutions), purchasing books for the library (66 percent), and granting sabbaticals for instructors to improve their knowledge of teaching subject matter (50 percent). In contrast, approximately half the continuing education deans believe funding to be poor or fair for purchasing library journals and for such activities as sabbaticals to do research and travel to conferences.

Although continuing education personnel in a single institution may perceive that competition for internal funding exists among advocates of teaching, research and community service, the national picture is quite different. Wealthy colleges and universities fund all of these activities at a significantly higher level than their less well-funded sister institutions. The "haves" have every thing; the "have-nots" are unable to provide adequate funding for excellence in teaching, community service, or research. That is to say, American colleges and universities are highly stratified.

Teaching is by far the most important factor in tenure decisions for faculty working in continuing education. It is the dominant evaluative dimension in tenure decisions for continuing educators at 80 percent of the institutions studied. It is surprising to see that community service was rated as the most important tenure factor in only 1 percent of the continuing education units. Community service was among the top three tenure factors in just over a quarter of the institutions (11 percent second most important, 17 percent third most important). Service to the university, such as by sitting on university-wide committees, is more important than service to the community in most colleges and universities. Community service is certainly an anemic member of the teaching/research/service triumvirate when it rates so poorly in the tenure decisions of continuing education professors.

Most of the colleges and universities in the sample granted merit salary raises to faculty in recognition of excellence in teaching. Less than half recognized excellence in research through merit raises, and not many more than a quarter of the institutions ever used merit raises to reward faculty for excellence in public service. It must be discouraging for many faculty who work very hard carrying out the public service mission of the continuing education unit when they are passed over at merit time and their salaries fall slowly behind those of their peers in traditional academic departments who devote all of their time to classroom teaching and research.

Research is most likely to be rewarded with merit salary raises in large urban, public universities that hold membership in one or both national continuing education professional organizations. Although

relationships are weaker, teaching and public service tend to be rewarded by merit awards for research. Institutions that can afford to reward faculty excellence in research are usually wealthy enough to reward teaching and service too.

There is little evidence that either the dean's teaching schedule or unionization among faculty and professional staff have a significant effect on the support of teaching in American colleges and universities.

Quality in Continuing Education

Twenty-four of the continuing education deans felt that none of their programs was outstanding, while three quarters of the deans believed that less than 40 percent of their programs were of outstanding quality. The deans agree that relatively few continuing education programs under their direction are outstanding.

Fully half of the deans responding to the survey reported that programs are evaluated annually, while another fifth are evaluated on a two to four year cycle. The remaining 29 percent are subject to review at more than five year intervals or never. The deans reported that programs are most frequently evaluated by administrators (71 percent), followed by faculty and staff (63 percent), external evaluators (38 percent), and others (27 percent).

Teaching quality was the factor most frequently reported as very important in the dean's assessment of continuing education programs (87 percent) followed by reputation within the institution (53 percent), student enrollment (48 percent), and the ratio of income generated to program expenses (42 percent). The latter two factors reflect the climate

of fiscal accountability which pervades judgments of quality about continuing education programs.

Forty-one percent of the continuing education deans felt that their impact on educational quality at their institution was limited or nonexistent, reflecting the widespread belief about the lack of centrality of the role and placement of continuing education deans. However, almost 60 percent believe they have a fair or great impact on the quality of education. Deans who work in public (as opposed to private) institutions and those with large faculties and large student bodies tend to believe their impact on quality is limited.

Continuing education deans rarely spend much money to upgrade fair or inferior programs. Maintaining outstanding programs or upgrading good programs so that they become outstanding comprise the resource allocation policies of 95 percent of the deans, as compared with only 6 percent (percentages do not sum 100 due to statistical rounding procedures) who concentrate on upgrading fair or inferior programs. The tendency to centralize resources in the most prestigious programs is most pronounced when the dean views national reputation as important in judging program quality.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Indiana, Pa.
15705
412-357-2222